that Government Order, No. 1997, dated 24th Kanni 1057, encouraged the people to plant trees on the banks of rivers and tanks and that several of such trees had been planted and enjoyed by them. The rules under Regulation II of 1067, dated 27th Karkadagom 1074, authorised the registry of such trees on *kuthagapattom* in the names of the holders for the assessed tax without limit of time. According to the present rules, the trees standing on *poramboke* lands, which had not already been registered, should be disposed of by public auction, while the trees standing on lands in the possession of any Government Department should be made over to that department and then disposed of in auction. The above rules, the Member submitted, were disadvantageous both to the Government and to the people alike. The rules were not clear as to whether they applied to the trees planted up by the Government, or to those standing on lands acquired by the Government, or to the spontaneous growth on *porambokes*, or to the trees planted by the people on Government lands. Many such trees in the Kalkulam, Eraniel and Vilavancode taluks had been registered in the names of the holders along with the land. But the representations of the people of Tovala and Agastiswaram taluks to register the trees alone in their names without the land had not been favourably considered by the Government. The Member, therefore, prayed—

(1) that such trees be permanently registered in the names of the holders and that a tax of 4 cash be imposed on a tree;

(2) that the Tahsildars be empowered to register, in the names of people for definite periods, *porambokes* lying adjacent to their registered holdings, which were not required either for the communal requirements of the people or for the Government; and

(3) that people be allowed to plant trees on river sides, tank sides, road sides and other open spaces.

The Member added that, by such registry, the Government would get an annual revenue of not less than Rs. 20,000.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

5. Desirability of granting the same relief to the owners of registered holdings on the banks of the Vamanapuram and Karamanai rivers as was granted to those on the banks of the Neyyar and Killiyar rivers.

Mr. K. Narayana Pillai (Member, Nedumangad taluk) said that, in the recent Survey, many lands on the banks of the Vamanapuram and Karamanai rivers were treated as *porambokes*, that there were many old improvements on such lands and that the lands with the fruit-bearing trees thereon were being enjoyed by the holders in the firm belief that they were included in their *ayacut* holdings. The trees on such lands had been taxed in the recent Settlement and the tax was being recovered by the Government. To treat the lands on the banks of the above two rivers as *porambokes* now would work real hardship to the ryots. When the trees, etc., on *porambokes* now on the banks of the Killiyar were similarly treated, a deputation from the Nedumangad Taluk Association complained to the Government, with the result that the proceedings started were ordered to be stopped. Similar lands on the banks of the Neyyar were ordered to be registered in the names of the holders. The Member, therefore, prayed that the treatment accorded to the lands on the banks of the Neyyar be extended to those on the banks of the Vamanapuram and Karamanai rivers.

Dewan's reply.—If the lands on the banks of the Vamanapuram and Karamanai rivers, mentioned by the Member, are similarly circumstanced as those on the banks of the Neyyar and Killiyar rivers, the concessions granted to the latter will be extended to them. A petition has been received from the inhabitants of the Nedumangad taluk in respect of the lands on the banks of the Karamanai river and this has been referred to the Peishkar for report. The representations of the Member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

about the lands on the banks of the Vamanapuram river will also be referred to the Peishkar and, on receipt of the Peishkar's final report, the matter will be disposed of.

6. Adoption of measures for remedying the grievances of the inhabitants of Vaikom taluk in respect of *porambokes* and *tharavila*.

Mr. P. R. Narayana Pillai (Member, Vaikom taluk) stated that the lands now treated as *porambokes* were, in the majority of instances, portions of lands included in the *ayacut* holdings, that there were buildings and trees more than 60 and 70 years old in the lands now treated as *porambokes*, that, in the recent Settlement, reductions in measurements were made so much so that even plots for which tax was being paid were considered as *porambokes*, and that, for the defects and irregularities of the Survey and Settlement officers, the people were required to pay a penalty under Regulation IV of 1091. The people made improvements on such lands in the belief that they formed part of their registered holdings; but they were now being punished under the Regulation for encroachment. Such a procedure was not consistent with the policy of the Government and with the spirit and wording of explanation III under section 3 of Regulation IV of 1091. The procedure followed in finding out *porambokes* was also peculiar. The owner was generally absent when measurements were taken and he came to know of the existence of *poramboke* only on receipt of notice to show cause why he should not be punished for encroachment. Even after the case was filed, he was not given an opportunity to prove that the land was included in the original *ayacut* measurements. Another point to be considered was the duration of the improvements carried out. How long improvements had been carried out had also to be ascertained. That would be an indirect, but conclusive, proof of the fact of long possession. If it was found that the owner regarded the land as his own *bona fide*, he should be exempted from the operation of section 6 of the Regulation. If the land was found to be a real *poramboke*, compensation should be given for the improvements effected. If the land was not required for any public purposes, it should be registered in the occupier's name. If it was considered that the land should be retained as *poramboke*, the cost of improvements should be given or at least the trees should be given on perpetual *kuthagapattom*. Where the improvements were such as could be removed, the occupier should be permitted to remove them.

It has been explicitly stated by the Government while passing the *Puduval* Rules that, in order to encourage ryots to extend cultivation, they were permitted to take up as much land as possible ; and the rules fixed a minimum rate of *tharavila* of Rs. 25 per acre on all reclamations from rivers, canals and backwaters. (*Vide* clause VI of section XI of the *Puduval* Rules dated 24th September 1914). To reclaim an acre of ground from backwaters for cocoanut cultivation, between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 1,500 had to be spent. In short, the total cost of reclaiming land from backwaters for cocoanut cultivation would come to Rs. 4,000 per acre including *tharavila*. It would take at least 6 to 8 years before any return could be expected. Even after the trees had begun to bear, the land would not fetch, if sold, half the capital outlay. Hence the *tharavila* imposed was unduly high.

The classification of reclaimed lands was made in a haphazard way. The *chalu porambokes* adjoining sterile *mundaka* fields were registered only on payment of Rs. 5 to 7 per cent. The *chalu porambokes* should be classed in the same way as the adjoining fields and registry made on recovery of the present minimum rate of *tharavila*.

The Member then made the following suggestions in regard to the fixing of *tharavila* on reclaimed lands:—

1. In addition to the minimum *tharavila*, a maximum rate, which should not be exceeded, should also be fixed, due consideration being paid to the amount of money invested in reclaiming the land.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly